

Remarks:

Applicant has read and considered the Office Action dated August 1, 2005 and the references cited therein. Claims 1-3 and 5 have been amended. Claims 4, 6 and 7 have been withdrawn. Claims 1-3 and 5 are currently pending.

In the Action, the election of the Species shown in Figure 3 was acknowledged. Claims 4, 6 and 7 have been withdrawn by Applicant. Applicant further notes that the Examiner agrees with Applicant's assertion that claim 1 is generic.

The priority claim has been acknowledged. It was noted that a certified copy of the foreign application has not been received. Applicant is obtaining a certified copy of the priority document and it will be submitted as required.

The disclosure was objected to for several formalities. The term "said" has been deleted from the specification. The specification has also been amended to adopt the suggested language of the Examiner. It was noted that elements 11 and 16 are referred to by different terms. The specification has been amended so that element 11 refers to an axle while element 16 refers to a pivot throughout. Finally, element 28 has been referred to as an attenuator, an actuator and a support. The specification has been amended so that element 28 has been indicated as being a support. Moreover, it was noted that there are two numerals 28 in Figure 3. Figure 3 has been amended so that the actuator is shown as element 28a. The specification has also been amended so that the reference to an attenuator has been changed to an actuator for consistency and correctness. Applicant asserts that no new matter has been added.

Claims 1-3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph as being non-enabling. The Action states that it is not clear from the specification and drawings how the steering device would operate as no detail to any mechanical operation/connection that would allow the actuator to steer the wheel arrangement by manipulating the tension rod is disclosed.

Applicant asserts that support is provided at the bottom of page 4 and the top of page 5.

Applicant further notes that actuator 28 was incorrectly identified as the attenuator at the bottom of page 4. Applicant asserts that the use of an electric actuator will be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. Moreover, Applicant notes that although tension rod 29 was recited in the claims and element 29 has been labeled in the drawings. The specification has been amended so that tension rod 29 is referenced in the specification. Applicant asserts that no new matter has been added. Applicant further asserts that the disclosure does provide sufficient support for one of ordinary skill in the art for enablement of claims 1-3 and 5.

Claims 1-3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has adopted the language suggested by the Examiner and has deleted the term "basically" from the application. With regard to claim 3, the claim has been amended so that first and second seats are recited and it is clear which seat is being referred to by the cylindrical seat. Applicant asserts that the rejection is traversed.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Grosseau. Claim 1 has been amended and now further recites that the first seat is a cylindrical seat provided with a steering lever put into rotation by a tension rod connected to a steering lever and controlled by an actuator. Applicant asserts that the steering device supporting a rocking wheel hub of a trailing arm suspension of a motor vehicle which is support for the wheel hub, comprises a connection element rotatably connected to the body of the suspension adapted to rotate in a plane substantially perpendicular to the ground and parallel to the longitudinal axis of the motor-vehicle and that is provided with attachments for the wheel hub and controlled by an elastic element adapted to limit the rotation, wherein the connection element rotates on an axis supported by a first seat adapted to rotate on an axle supported in rotation by a second seat, connected to an end of the arm of the suspension not connected to the body work of the motor-vehicle wherein both rotary movements are allowed in two planes substantially perpendicular to each other wherein the first seat is a cylindrical seat provided with a steering lever and is put into

rotation by a tension rod connected to said steering lever and controlled by an actuator, is neither shown nor suggested by Grosseau or any other prior art. The present invention provides for improved suspension and stability and is a simple and reliable steering mechanism. The present invention provides for controlling maneuverability and comfort allowing sufficient clearance and mutual longitudinal displacement that prevents unwanted steering angles to occur when the wheel receives an impact. Applicant asserts that Grosseau or any other prior art or combination does not achieve these advantages and that the invention recited in claim 1 is neither shown nor suggested by Grosseau or any combination of prior art. Applicant asserts that claim 1 as submitted, patentably distinguishes over Grosseau and any other prior art. Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grosseau in view of Bruehl. The Action states that Bruehl discloses an actuator to control a tension rod connected to a steering lever to rotate a wheel support for steering the wheel arrangement and that Bruehl shows that the actuator is mounted apart from the suspension members and what would be termed "bodywork" of the motor vehicle. The Action states that it would have been obvious to combine the references. As stated above, Applicant asserts that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Grosseau. Bruehl fails to overcome the disadvantages the prior art and even when combined with Grosseau does not achieve the advantages provided by claim 1. Applicant asserts that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Grosseau, Bruehl or any combination thereof or any other prior art. Because claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the combination, Applicant asserts that claims 2, 3 and 5 also patentably distinguish over the combination for at least these reasons as well as others.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/687,390
Reply to Office Action dated August 1, 2005

A speedy and favorable action on the merits is hereby solicited. If the Examiner feels that a telephone interview may be helpful in this matter, please contact Applicant's representative at 612.336.4728.



Date: 12/01/05

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
612/332-5300



Gregory A. Sebald
Reg. No. 33,280
GAS/krn